

Remarks

Claims 1-24 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Applicants assert that the application is in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Applicants respectfully request that a Notice of Allowability be provided or that the finality of the current rejections be withdrawn.

112 Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 112 for the recitation “each server” lacking antecedent basis. This recitation has been replaced with “each computer source” which is believed to have proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, the rejection may be withdrawn.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Bedingfield (US2005/0050460) in view of Wolfe (US Pat 6,341,305). Claims 19-20 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the preceding combination in further view of Nawaz (US Pat 5,959,621). Claims 7-23 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the preceding combination in further view of Timm (US Pat 6,055,268). Claim 21 stands rejected as being unpatentable over the preceding combination in further view of Buhler (US Pat 6,104,704). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants assert that the rejections to all claims are overcome due to Bedingfield not being valid prior art for two separate reasons. Initially, Bedingfield is a continuation-in-part application that has a filing date after that of the present application but a priority date earlier than the filing date of the present application. It should be noted that at least a portion of the disclosures of Bedingfield relied upon in these rejections are not supported by the parent application such that Bedingfield is not valid prior art for those disclosures. Furthermore, the other cited references do not address the disclosures relied upon in Bedingfield such that the combination fails to render claims 1-24 unpatentable.

Applicants further assert that Bedingfield is not prior art under 35 USC 103(c). Even if Bedingfield was valid prior art based on its priority date, it would be prior art under 35 USC 102(e). However, it was commonly owned with the present invention at

the time the present invention was made as evidenced by the assignments for the parent Bedingfield application recorded on June 4, 2001 at reel/frame 011851/0783 and for the current application recorded on September 12, 2001 at reel/frame 012195/0303. Thus, 35 USC 103(c) states that such a commonly owned 102(e) reference is not valid prior art when used in a 103(a) rejection. As noted above, the additional references do not address the disclosures relied upon in Bedingfield such that the combination fails to render claims 1-24 unpatentable for this additional reason.

Therefore, Applicants assert that claims 1-24 are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons noted above. Applicants reserve the right to make additional arguments in future responses with respect to the other references used in combination with Bedingfield.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-24 is in condition for allowance after final. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 16, 2005


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093